

CENTER FOR DISABILITY ACCESS  
Amanda Seabock, Esq., SBN 289900  
Prathima Price, Esq., SBN 321378  
Dennis Price, Esq., SBN 279082  
Mail: 8033 Linda Vista Road, Suite 200  
San Diego, CA 92111  
(858) 375-7385; (888) 422-5191 fax  
[amandas@potterhandy.com](mailto:amandas@potterhandy.com)

Attorneys for Plaintiff

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

**Scott Johnson**

Plaintiff,

v.

**Homestead HB, Inc.**, a California  
Corporation

Defendants.

**Case No.**

**Complaint For Damages And  
Injunctive Relief For Violations  
Of: Americans With Disabilities  
Act; Unruh Civil Rights Act**

Plaintiff Scott Johnson complains of Homestead HB, Inc., a California Corporation, and alleges as follows:

**PARTIES:**

1. Plaintiff is a California resident with physical disabilities. Plaintiff is a level C-5 quadriplegic. He cannot walk and also has significant manual dexterity impairments. He uses a wheelchair for mobility and has a specially equipped van.

2. Defendant Homestead HB, Inc. owned L & L Hawaiian Barbecue located at or about 3580 Homestead Rd, Santa Clara, California, in October 2020.

1       3. Defendant Homestead HB, Inc. owns L & L Hawaiian Barbeque  
2 ("Restaurant") located at or about 3580 Homestead Rd, Santa Clara,  
3 California, currently.

4       4. Plaintiff does not know the true names of Defendants, their business  
5 capacities, their ownership connection to the property and business, or their  
6 relative responsibilities in causing the access violations herein complained of,  
7 and alleges a joint venture and common enterprise by all such Defendants.  
8 Plaintiff is informed and believes that each of the Defendants herein is  
9 responsible in some capacity for the events herein alleged, or is a necessary  
10 party for obtaining appropriate relief. Plaintiff will seek leave to amend when  
11 the true names, capacities, connections, and responsibilities of the Defendants  
12 are ascertained.

13  
14       **JURISDICTION & VENUE:**

15       5. The Court has subject matter jurisdiction over the action pursuant to 28  
16 U.S.C. § 1331 and § 1343(a)(3) & (a)(4) for violations of the Americans with  
17 Disabilities Act of 1990, 42 U.S.C. § 12101, et seq.

18       6. Pursuant to supplemental jurisdiction, an attendant and related cause  
19 of action, arising from the same nucleus of operative facts and arising out of  
20 the same transactions, is also brought under California's Unruh Civil Rights  
21 Act, which act expressly incorporates the Americans with Disabilities Act.

22       7. Venue is proper in this court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) and is  
23 founded on the fact that the real property which is the subject of this action is  
24 located in this district and that Plaintiff's cause of action arose in this district.

25  
26       **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS:**

27       8. Plaintiff went to the Restaurant in October 2020 with the intention to  
28 avail himself of its goods motivated in part to determine if the defendants

1 comply with the disability access laws.

2 9. The Restaurant is a facility open to the public, a place of public  
3 accommodation, and a business establishment.

4 10. Unfortunately, on the date of the plaintiff's visit, the defendants failed  
5 to provide wheelchair accessible door hardware in conformance with the ADA  
6 Standards as it relates to wheelchair users like the plaintiff.

7 11. The Restaurant provides door hardware to its customers but fails to  
8 provide wheelchair accessible door hardware.

9 12. A problem that plaintiff encountered is that the entrance door hardware  
10 had a pull bar style handle that required tight grasping to operate.

11 13. Plaintiff believes that there are other features of the door hardware that  
12 likely fail to comply with the ADA Standards and seeks to have fully compliant  
13 door hardware available for wheelchair users.

14 14. On information and belief the defendants currently fail to provide  
15 wheelchair accessible door hardware.

16 15. Additionally, on the date of the plaintiff's visit, the defendants failed to  
17 provide wheelchair accessible dining surfaces in conformance with the ADA  
18 Standards as it relates to wheelchair users like the plaintiff.

19 16. The Restaurant provides dining surfaces to its customers but fails to  
20 provide wheelchair accessible dining surfaces.

21 17. One problem that plaintiff encountered is the lack of sufficient knee or  
22 toe clearance under the dining surfaces for wheelchair users.

23 18. Plaintiff believes that there are other features of the dining surfaces that  
24 likely fail to comply with the ADA Standards and seeks to have fully compliant  
25 dining surfaces available for wheelchair users.

26 19. On information and belief the defendants currently fail to provide  
27 wheelchair accessible dining surfaces.

28 20. These barriers relate to and impact the plaintiff's disability. Plaintiff

1 personally encountered these barriers.

2 21. As a wheelchair user, the plaintiff benefits from and is entitled to use  
3 wheelchair accessible facilities. By failing to provide accessible facilities, the  
4 defendants denied the plaintiff full and equal access.

5 22. The failure to provide accessible facilities created difficulty and  
6 discomfort for the Plaintiff.

7 23. The defendants have failed to maintain in working and useable  
8 conditions those features required to provide ready access to persons with  
9 disabilities.

10 24. The barriers identified above are easily removed without much  
11 difficulty or expense. They are the types of barriers identified by the  
12 Department of Justice as presumably readily achievable to remove and, in fact,  
13 these barriers are readily achievable to remove. Moreover, there are numerous  
14 alternative accommodations that could be made to provide a greater level of  
15 access if complete removal were not achievable.

16 25. Plaintiff will return to the Restaurant to avail himself of its goods and to  
17 determine compliance with the disability access laws once it is represented to  
18 him that the Restaurant and its facilities are accessible. Plaintiff is currently  
19 deterred from doing so because of his knowledge of the existing barriers and  
20 his uncertainty about the existence of yet other barriers on the site. If the  
21 barriers are not removed, the plaintiff will face unlawful and discriminatory  
22 barriers again.

23 26. Given the obvious and blatant nature of the barriers and violations  
24 alleged herein, the plaintiff alleges, on information and belief, that there are  
25 other violations and barriers on the site that relate to his disability. Plaintiff will  
26 amend the complaint, to provide proper notice regarding the scope of this  
27 lawsuit, once he conducts a site inspection. However, please be on notice that  
28 the plaintiff seeks to have all barriers related to his disability remedied. See

*Doran v. 7-11*, 524 F.3d 1034 (9th Cir. 2008) (holding that once a plaintiff encounters one barrier at a site, he can sue to have all barriers that relate to his disability removed regardless of whether he personally encountered them).

**I. FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION: VIOLATION OF THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT OF 1990** (On behalf of Plaintiff and against all Defendants.) (42 U.S.C. section 12101, et seq.)

27. Plaintiff re-pleads and incorporates by reference, as if fully set forth again herein, the allegations contained in all prior paragraphs of this complaint.

28. Under the ADA, it is an act of discrimination to fail to ensure that the privileges, advantages, accommodations, facilities, goods and services of any place of public accommodation is offered on a full and equal basis by anyone who owns, leases, or operates a place of public accommodation. See 42 U.S.C. § 12182(a). Discrimination is defined, inter alia, as follows:

- a. A failure to make reasonable modifications in policies, practices, or procedures, when such modifications are necessary to afford goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or accommodations to individuals with disabilities, unless the accommodation would work a fundamental alteration of those services and facilities. 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(ii).
- b. A failure to remove architectural barriers where such removal is readily achievable. 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(iv). Barriers are defined by reference to the ADA Standards.
- c. A failure to make alterations in such a manner that, to the maximum extent feasible, the altered portions of the facility are readily accessible to and usable by individuals with disabilities, including individuals who use wheelchairs or to ensure that, to the

1 maximum extent feasible, the path of travel to the altered area and  
2 the bathrooms, telephones, and drinking fountains serving the  
3 altered area, are readily accessible to and usable by individuals  
4 with disabilities. 42 U.S.C. § 12183(a)(2).

5 29. When a business provides facilities such as door hardware, it must  
6 provide accessible door hardware.

7 30. Here, accessible door hardware has not been provided in conformance  
8 with the ADA Standards.

9 31. When a business provides facilities such as dining surfaces, it must  
10 provide accessible dining surfaces.

11 32. Here, accessible dining surfaces have not been provided in  
12 conformance with the ADA Standards.

13 33. The Safe Harbor provisions of the 2010 Standards are not applicable  
14 here because the conditions challenged in this lawsuit do not comply with the  
15 1991 Standards.

16 34. A public accommodation must maintain in operable working condition  
17 those features of its facilities and equipment that are required to be readily  
18 accessible to and usable by persons with disabilities. 28 C.F.R. § 36.211(a).

19 35. Here, the failure to ensure that the accessible facilities were available  
20 and ready to be used by the plaintiff is a violation of the law.

21  
22 **II. SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION: VIOLATION OF THE UNRUH CIVIL**  
23 **RIGHTS ACT** (On behalf of Plaintiff and against all Defendants.) (Cal. Civ.  
24 Code § 51-53.)

25 36. Plaintiff repleads and incorporates by reference, as if fully set forth  
26 again herein, the allegations contained in all prior paragraphs of this  
27 complaint. The Unruh Civil Rights Act (“Unruh Act”) guarantees, inter alia,  
28 that persons with disabilities are entitled to full and equal accommodations,

1 advantages, facilities, privileges, or services in all business establishment of  
2 every kind whatsoever within the jurisdiction of the State of California. Cal.  
3 Civ. Code §51(b).

4 37. The Unruh Act provides that a violation of the ADA is a violation of the  
5 Unruh Act. Cal. Civ. Code, § 51(f).

6 38. Defendants' acts and omissions, as herein alleged, have violated the  
7 Unruh Act by, inter alia, denying, or aiding, or inciting the denial of, Plaintiff's  
8 rights to full and equal use of the accommodations, advantages, facilities,  
9 privileges, or services offered.

10 39. Because the violation of the Unruh Civil Rights Act resulted in difficulty,  
11 discomfort or embarrassment for the plaintiff, the defendants are also each  
12 responsible for statutory damages, i.e., a civil penalty. (Civ. Code § 55.56(a)-  
13 (c).)

14 40. Although the plaintiff encountered frustration and difficulty by facing  
15 discriminatory barriers, even manifesting itself with minor and fleeting  
16 physical symptoms, the plaintiff does not value this very modest physical  
17 personal injury greater than the amount of the statutory damages.

18  
19 **PRAYER:**

20 Wherefore, Plaintiff prays that this Court award damages and provide  
21 relief as follows:

22 1. For injunctive relief, compelling Defendants to comply with the  
23 Americans with Disabilities Act and the Unruh Civil Rights Act. Note: the  
24 plaintiff is not invoking section 55 of the California Civil Code and is not  
25 seeking injunctive relief under the Disabled Persons Act at all.

26 2. Damages under the Unruh Civil Rights Act, which provides for actual  
27 damages and a statutory minimum of \$4,000 for each offense.  
28

1           3. Reasonable attorney fees, litigation expenses and costs of suit, pursuant  
2 to 42 U.S.C. § 12205; and Cal. Civ. Code §§ 52.

3  
4 Dated: December 8, 2020

CENTER FOR DISABILITY ACCESS

5  
6 

7  
8 By: \_\_\_\_\_

9 Amanda Seabock, Esq.  
Attorney for plaintiff  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28